



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/632,099	08/01/2003	Richard O. Chen	27763-705.501	1917
21971 7590 09/12/2008 WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI 650 PAGE MILL ROAD PALO ALTO, CA 94304-1050				
EXAMINER				
RIGGS II, LARRY D				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1631				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/12/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<i>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</i>	Application No. 10/632,099 Examiner LARRY D. RIGGS II	Applicant(s) CHEN ET AL. Art Unit 1631
--	--	---

All Participants: **Status of Application:** _____
 (1) LARRY D. RIGGS II. (3) _____.
 (2) Paul Borchardt. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 11 September 2008 **Time:** _____

Type of Interview:
☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description: _____ .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:
Claims 57 and 58

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Larry D. Riggs II/
 Larry D. Riggs II, Ph.D., J.D.
 Examiner, Art Unit 1631

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner Riggs explained that while the original invention elected on 19 October 2007 were claims 1-32 and 58, the Office Action mailed 19 November 2007 mistakenly rejected the elements of claim 58 but mistakenly referred to claim 57. Subsequently, amended claims received 19 May 2008 mistakenly mislabeled claim 58 as claim 57 while still encompassing the elements of the original claim 58, and subsequently cancelling claim 58. Attorney Borchardt agreed to have the currently amended claim 57, correctly labeled as claim 58. Likewise, attorney Borchardt agreed that claims 6, 10-12, 15-57 and 59-61 are cancelled and claims 1-5, 7-9, 13, 14 and 58 are currently pending and under consideration..